

From: [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: RE: Benthic Interpretive Approach Comments
Date: 09/12/2006 01:23 PM

Yes, I agree we shouldn't eliminate samples without justification. We had discussed them re-examining the sediment from these stations if they still had an archived sample to see if discrete pockets (e.g. like pencil pitch) of PAH material was present that could lead to bioavailability differences. However, I think we do have an indication of issues at GASCO from the standpoint of known pencil pitch releases. My concern is that now that the comment is removed, we don't know how they are handling these samples or if further investigation is planned. I would hate to see them ultimately re-used in a different model.

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2006 1:13 PM
To: PETERSON Jenn L
Cc: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Re: Benthic Interpretive Approach Comments

Just making deals.....

Actually, I do not recall "withdrawing" the comment. However, I do recall discussing this comment in the context of directing the LWG to not use the PAH value and to rely on TPH-D as a surrogate - an approach I understand that they do not agree with. I am concerned with eliminating data from consideration arbitrarily unless we have some measure of bioavailability or some other logical justification.

Eric

PETERSON Jenn L
<PETERSON.Jenn@
eq.state.or.us>

09/12/2006 11:34
AM

To
Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
cc
Subject
Benthic Interpretive Approach
Comments

Eric,

Quick question - why was comment number 9 "withdrawn"? (citing personal communication Lisa Saban and Eric Blischke).

-Jennifer